



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,354	07/02/2001	Pekka Ketola	460-010421-US(PAR)	8266

2512 7590 03/01/2006

PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER

LIN, WEN TAI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/897,354

Applicant(s)

KETOLA, PEKKA

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-15 and 17-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6, 8-15 and 17-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-15 and 17-24 are presented for examination.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.
3. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-15 and 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Picard et al. (hereafter "Picard") [U.S. Pat. No. 6233318] in view of Official Notice.
4. Picard was cited in the previous office action.
5. As to claim 1, Picard teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a system for controlling at least two remote mailboxes [e.g., 115 and 120, Figs.4], located in at least one e-mail servers [note that the mailboxes are inherently associated with at least one e-mail servers] comprising:

at least a first connection between a wireless terminal [col.4, lines 4-14] and an e-mail server maintaining a first remote mailbox [e.g., a connection maintained between 110 and 115 of Fig.4], and a second connection between the terminal and an e-mail server maintaining a second remote mailbox [e.g., the connection maintained between

110 and 120 of Fig.4], said terminal comprising a control unit for controlling said remote mailboxes simultaneously with the first and second connections [col.5, lines 13-21; col.2, lines 26-33; col.13, lines 11-39; note that connection from the terminal to the first and second mailboxes is achieved by substantially simultaneous separate TCP/IP sessions or creating two browsing instances, each connected to a mailbox].

Picard does not specifically teach that the first and second connections are PDP (Packet Data Protocol) connections.

However, Official Notice is taken that using a wireless device with a PDP connection of the GPRS system for accessing a mailbox via the Internet is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that a GPRS subscriber may also access to Picard's multiple mailboxes by creating a plurality of browsing instances because the GPRS's PDP connection is one of the available wireless communication means that have access to Internet contents or mailboxes.

6. As to claim 3, Picard further teaches that an e-mail program [e.g., the browser] is arranged to be used for controlling said remote mailboxes, which e-mail program is provided with the capability to control several remote mailboxes [e.g., issuing a refresh request] substantially simultaneously, and in which each remote mailbox is provided with a unique identification, such as an icon or a name [col.13, lines 11-40; col.21, lines 24 – 34].

7. As to claim 4, Picard further teaches that a notification of an e-mail message that has arrived in one of said remote mailboxes is arranged to be produced for the user, characterized in that said notification is arranged to be provided with a unique identification of that remote mailbox to which the e-mail message has arrived [col.17, lines 8-15; col.20, lines 56-59; col.13, lines 11-21].

8. As to claims 5-6, Picard further teaches that the user in the e-mail program is provided with the capability to formulate and send e-mail messages [col.3, lines 60-62; col.18, line 66 – col.19, line 25; Fig.11]. Picard does not specifically teach that the e-mail address of the user to be attached to the e-mail message to be transmitted is arranged to be selected in the e-mail program.

However, it is well known in the art to click the “reply” button for replying a message, wherein the original receiving mailbox’s address is used as a sending mailbox. In a like manner, one would like to provide a sending mailbox’s address that is consistent with an address that the recipient of the mail can be replied to. Since Picard’s system integrates existing mailboxes of a subscriber and allow reception of mails from non-subscribers (i.e., the non-subscribers only knows the address of a convention mailboxes), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the received mailbox as default sending address because by doing so it would make Picard’s system transparent to the non-subscribers [col.8, lines 33-34 and 46- 67].

9. As to claims 8, 10-15 and 17-24, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1 and 3-6, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 3-6 above.

10. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/28/2005 for claims 1, 3-6, 8-15 and 17-23 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

12. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Examiner note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the contest of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(571)273-3969 for status inquires draft communication.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Tai Lin

February 21, 2006

Wen-Tai Lin
2/22/06